

Application No. 10/083,324

Docket No. CTX-079

AMENDMENT TO THE DRAWINGS

The examiner objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a). Replacement Figure 3 is submitted herewith addressing this objection.

Application No. 10/083,324

Docket No. CTX-079

REMARKS

Claims 1-68 were presented for examination and claims 1-68 are rejected. In the present amendment, claims 1, 23, 45 and 68 have been amended, and claim 67 cancelled. No new matter has been introduced. Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-66 and 68 will be currently pending in this application, of which claims 1, 23, 45 and 68 are independent. Applicants submit that claims 1-66 and 68 are in condition for allowance.

The following comments address all stated grounds of rejection. Applicants respectfully traverse all rejections and urge the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance in view of the remarks set forth below.

Interview Summary

Applicants and their attorneys thank the Examiner for the Examiner's Interview conducted on September 27, 2006. The substance of the interview included discussing the Examiner's Response to Arguments in the Final Office Action of August 16, 2006. The Applicants' attorneys and the Examiner also discussed clarification of the claims in view of the cited art and the Examiner's arguments.

Drawing Objections

The Examiner objects to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) for not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Applicants submit a replacement Figure 3. No new matter has been introduced. Applicants submit that the drawings are in condition for acceptance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objection to the drawings.

Application No. 10/083,324

Docket No. CTX-079

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-6, 10-19, 21, 23-28, 32-42, 44-52, 56-64 and 66-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0018913 to Brezak et al. ("Brezak"). Claim 67 has been cancelled, mooted this rejection with respect to this claim.

Claims 1, 23, 45, and 68 are independent claims. Claims 2-6, 10-19 and 21 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1. Claims 24-28, 32-42 and 44 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 23. Claims 46-52, 56-64, and 66 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 45. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that Brezak fails to disclose each and every element recited in claims 1-6, 10-19, 21, 23-28, 32-42, 44-52, 56-64, 66 and 68, as amended.

Independent Claims 1, 23, 45 and 68 Patentably Distinguished over Brezak

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Amended independent claim 1 is a method for authenticating a client to a content server. Amended independent claims 23, 45 and 68 are systems for authenticating a client to a content server. These independent claims are directed towards a ticket authority generating a first ticket and a second ticket, wherein the second ticket is generated before the first ticket is validated and the second ticket is disabled from use. Brezak fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention.

Brezak does not disclose generating a first ticket and a second ticket, wherein the second ticket is generated before the first ticket is validated and the second ticket is disabled from use. Instead, Brezak discusses generating a second enabled single ticket for use by the client after

Application No. 10/083,324

Docket No. CTX-079

validating a first enabled single ticket. In response to a user logging on at a client, the authentication service of Brezak generates an enabled ticket generating ticket. When the client wants to access the server, the client sends a ticket granting request with the enabled ticket granting ticket to the authentication service. After validating the ticket granting ticket, the authentication service generates an enabled service ticket for the client to access the server. Thus, Brezak fails to disclose generating a first ticket and a second ticket, wherein the second ticket is generated before the first ticket is validated and the second ticket is disabled from use.

Because Brezak fails to disclose each and every feature of independent claims 1, 23, 45 and 68 as amended, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 23, 45 and 68 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Claims 2-6, 10-19 and 21 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1. Claims 24-28, 32-42 and 44 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 23. Claims 46-52, 56-64 and 66 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 45. Thus, Applicants submit that dependent claims 2-6, 10-19, 21, 24-28, 32-42, 44, 46-52, 56-64 and 66 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 1-6, 10-19, 21, 23-28, 32-42, 44-52, 56-64, 66 and 68 under 35 U.S.C. §102.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 20, 22, 43 and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Brezak. Claims 20, 22, 43 and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Brezak in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0233554 to Litai et al. ("Litai"). Claims 7-9, 20 and 22 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1, as

Application No. 10/083,324

Docket No. CTX-079

amended. Claims 29-31 and 43 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 23, as amended. Claims 53-55 and 65 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 45. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that Brezak in view of Litai, alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest each and every element recited in claims 7-9, 20, 22, 29-31, 43, 53-55 and 65.

Claims Dependent from Patentable Independent Claims 1, 23 and 45

For the reasons discussed above in connection with the rejection of independent claims 1, 23 and 45, Applicants submit independent claims 1, 23, and 45 and are patentable and in condition for allowance. Thus, claims dependent from claims 1, 23, and 45 are patentable and in condition for allowance. As such, Applicants submit dependent claims 7-9, 20, 22, 29-31, 43, 53-55 and 65 are patentable and in condition for allowance.

The Examiner cites Litai in the Office Action only to suggest one ordinarily skilled in the art might modify Brezak to have the content server verify the ticket. However, as with Brezak, Litai does not disclose, teach or generating a first ticket and a second ticket, wherein the second ticket is generated before the first ticket is validated and the second ticket is disabled from use. Therefore, Brezak in view of Litai fails to teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

Because Brezak in view of Litai, alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest each and every element of independent claims 1, 23 and 45, Applicants submit dependent claims 7-9, 20, 22, 29-31, 43, 53-55, and 65 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 7-9, 20, 22, 29-31, 43, 53-55, and 65 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Application No. 10/083,324

Docket No. CTX-079

CONCLUSION

In light of the aforementioned arguments, Applicants contend that each of the Examiner's rejections has been adequately addressed and all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration, withdrawal of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of all of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorney would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHOATE, HALL & STEWART, LLP

Dated: December 13, 2006

/Christopher J. McKenna/
Christopher J. McKenna
Registration No. 53,302
Attorney for Applicants

Choate, Hall & Stewart, LLP
Two International Place
Boston, MA 02110
(617) 248-5000